

(d) REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 17, 2007. Claims 4-17 are presented for examination. Claims 1-3 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 4-14 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claim 4 is in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The canceled claims will not be further addressed herein.

The title has been amended to make it more descriptive, as required in the Office Action. The abstract has been carefully reviewed and amended as to matters of form.

New claims 4-14 are supported as follows:

Claim 14 at page 6, lines 1-3, Fig. 6, at page 11, lines 18-26 and page 14, lines 1-3; Claims 5-6 in Fig. 1; Claims 7 and 8 in Fig. 2; Claim 9 at page 13, line 16; Claim 10 at page 10, line 22; Claim 11 at Figs. 1-3; Claim 12 at page 13, lines 20-26; Claim 13 at page 11, lines 1-6 and page 17, line 26; Claim 14 at page 11, line 7; Claim 15 at Fig. 1; Claim 16 at Fig. 4 and Claim 17 at page 12, lines 20-25.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as anticipated by Harvey, '360 and Claim 3 was rejected as obvious over Harvey '360 in view of Hirano '462. It is submitted the rejections have been obviated by the present claims.

The present claimed invention includes a top-emission type display device as noted on specification page 6, lines 1-3 in which emitted light radiates from a side opposite the substrate side. As noted on page 14, lines 1-3, by employing the claimed arrangement of protecting films, water is suppressed from the contacting atmosphere surrounding the display region, see also page 26, lines 1-11. In the top emission display device, light is emitted into the

atmosphere which contacts the top of the device and, accordingly, the reverse penetrating path of water is inhibited from the top of the device to its interior. The light extraction side upper electrode 104 is spaced farther from the substrate than the lower electrode which is used as a light reflection electrode. As seen on page 10, lines 19-24, patterned Cr spaced on the substrate 101 was anode 102 and ITO was electrode 104 which is opposed to the substrate. The substrate is not exposed to the atmosphere, since light is not emitted therethrough on its way to the exterior of the device.

To the contrary, in Harvey '360, a bottom emission display device is illustrated. As shown in Harvey, Figs. 1 and 4-7, the substrate 11 is an optically clear plastic. Array 12 is formed on clear plastic substrate 11. Light is emitted from the array and exits the device through the optically clear plastic substrate 11. To prevent oxygen and water vapor from permeating the plastic substrate from the light-emitting side, a multi-layer overcoat 16 is deposited between the substrate and array to protect array 12.

As shown in Harvey, Fig. 4, cathode 15 and anode 13 sandwich array 12. Anode 13 is adjacent substrate 11, while cathode 15 is on the opposite side of array 12. Inorganic layer 28 composed of a stable metal as Al or In, encapsulates array 12. This metal acts also as an anti-reflection layer. This means that light is extracted through the optically clear substrate. If desired, a metal can 32, shown in Fig. 6 or a laminated metal foil 52 shown in Fig. 10, can seal the array (and prevent passage of light therethrough).

Accordingly, Harvey '360 has an opposite configuration from the claimed invention. In the present invention the protective layers spaced over the array at the side opposite the substrate, shield the array at the light-emission top side which is exposed to the air. Light is

not emitted through the substrate. In Harvey, the multi-layer overcoating is sandwiched between the clear substrate and the light-extracting anode and is not above the light-extracting electrode and array as in the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter Saxon/
Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 634273v1